COMMENTS ON MICROGYNELLA, SOMMERFELTIA, AND ASTEROPSIS (ASTERACEAE: ASTEREAE)

Guy L. Nesom

Department of Botany, University of Texas, Austin, Texas 78713 U.S.A.

ABSTRACT

Microgynella, Sommerfeltia, and Asteropsis are accepted as distinct, monotypic genera, and a taxonomic summary is presented for each. All three are limited in distribution to southeastern Brazil, Uruguay, Paraguay, and northeastern Argentina. They are closely related among themselves and to several other South American genera: Podocoma, Rhabdanthus, Inulopsis, Laennecia, and Blakiella.

KEY WORDS: Microgynella, Sommerfeltia, Asteropsis, Astereae, Asteraceae

Three Astereaean species of southeastern South America each represent a monotypic genus. Nomenclatural summaries and comments on their delimitation and relationships are presented here in clarification of their taxonomic status.

The status of Microgynella and Sommerfeltia

Grau (1975) provided the new generic name Microgynella Grau for a South American species originally treated as the monotypic genus Microgyne Less. (Lessing 1832) and later transferred by Grisebach (1879) to the genus Vittadinia A. Rich. Grau correctly observed that Vittadinia is an Australasian endemic; he noted that Microgynella should be placed nearest Hysterionica Willd. and Sommerfeltia Less., but he did not discuss the nature or implication of their relationship to Microgynella.

Hysterionica sensu lato comprises two distinct species groups (Nesom 1993) that are now divided into two separate genera, the "jasionoides group" (= Hysterionica sensu stricto) and the "pinifolia group" (= Neja D. Don) (Nesom

1994). Plants of Neja, which are perhaps those referred to by Grau (1975) as Hysterionica, are perennial with basally disposed, linear leaves and solitary heads on long scapes or bracteate stems. Both Hysterionica and Neja, however, differ from Microgynella in their uniseriate pistillate flowers, eglandular achenes that are fertile in both ray and disc flowers, prominent orange-resinous ducts accompanying the veins of phyllaries and achenes, and style branches (disc flowers) with deltate collecting appendages. Microgynella cannot be regarded as a particularly close relative of either Hysterionica or Neja.

The resemblance of Microgynella to Sommerfeltia was early recognized by Hooker & Arnott (1836), who placed the former (as Microgyne) as a synonym of the latter. They are similar in the following features: herbaceous-perennial habit, the roots and lower stems lignescent; leaves densely arranged along the stems, glandular, stiff, pinnately lobed or dissected with linear divisions; ray flowers with white, short ligules; style branches with linear-lanceolate collecting appendages (clearly in Microgynella, apparently in Sommerfeltia, where the stigmatic lines are absent); and erostrate achenes with glandular faces. Both genera are restricted to southeastern Brazil and adjacent areas of Uruguay and Argentina.

In the key to genera of Astereae in the province of Buenos Aires, Sommerfeltia was distinguished by Cabrera (1963, p. 10) from Microgynella (the latter identified as "Vittadinia") and other genera by the following: "Arbustitos enanos, con hojas pinatisectas espiniformes (Sommerfeltia)." The putative difference in habit between Sommerfeltia and Microgynella is slight (both have a suffrutescent tendency), and the leaves of both are rigid and narrowly divided. The differences between the two genera, however, are more numerous and more significant than in Cabrera's comparison, as outlined in the following summary:

Microgynella:

Stems, leaves, and phyllaries with sessile or slightly sunken, resinous glands, sparsely hispid and with arachnoid vestiture; stems monocephalous; leaves linear, apically trifurcate with a pair of linear lobes, but the uppermost and lower leaves commonly entire; disc flowers fertile; achenes densely sericeous on the faces and margins, also densely glandular, broadly oblanceolate-obconic and apically truncate, the margins more or less parallel at the apex, with a broad pappus insertion; and pappus bristles reddish-brown.

Sommerfeltia:

Stems, leaves, and phyllaries stipitate-glandular, without arachnoid vestiture; stems monocephalous or less commonly distally branched and bearing several heads in a loosely paniculate-corymboid capitulescence; leaves pinnately dissected with linear lobes;

disc flowers with sterile ovaries; achenes densely sericeous at the base or on the margins, the faces glandular but sparsely hairy, obovate and apically rounded, the margins apically confluent, with a narrow pappus insertion; and pappus bristles whitish.

Sommerfeltia cabrerae Chebat., a recently described species from northern Uruguay (Chebataroff 1981), cannot be accepted within Sommerfeltia. It differs from typical Sommerfeltia particularly in its entire leaves, completely fertile disc flowers, and differently shaped achenes with glandular, evenly strigosesericeous faces. As observed by Chebataroff, it closely resembles Hysterionica filiformis (Spreng.) Cabrera (= Neja filiformis [Spreng.] Nees), but he rejected the species from Hysterionica sensu lato because of its lack of a short, outer series of pappus scales. Pappus variability among other species of Neja (Nesom 1994), however, includes such as found in S. cabrerae, but the correct generic placement of the latter is still under consideration (Nesom in prep.).

The status of Asteropsis

Asteropsis Less. comprises the single species A. macrocephala Less., which is restricted to southern Brazil and adjacent Uruguay. The species was regarded as a member of Podocoma Cass. by Bentham (1873), apparently because of its rostrate achenes, but it was accepted as an independent genus by Baker (1882) and Hoffmann (1890). Grau (1977) also regarded it as a synonym of Podocoma, a position apparently followed in the recent phylogenetic analysis and classification by Zhang & Bremer (1993). If treated within Podocoma, this species would have to be set apart from all of the others, differing in its combination of stems simple or 1-2 branched near the apex, densely arachnoid vestiture, entire, linear, non-clasping, densely arranged leaves, and large (20-35 mm in diameter), mostly solitary heads, linear-lanceolate phyllaries in 4-5 slightly graduated series, multiseriate ray flowers with long ligules (apparently white), disc flowers with sterile ovaries, and large (4-5 mm long). broadly obovate achenes with strongly thickened marginal ribs, a distinctively short-beaked apex, and sericeous, eglandular faces and margins. The features of Asteropsis place it among a group of South American genera that includes Podocoma (Nesom & Zanowiak 1994) as well as Microgynella, Sommerfeltia, Inulopsis Hoffm., Rhabdanthus Nesom, Laennecia Cass., and Blakiella Cuatr. Among these, however, Asteropsis is justifiably treated as an independent genus resembling Microgynella and Sommerfeltia in its densely crowded, linear leaves.

February 1994

Taxonomic summaries

- I. Microgynella Grau (nom. nov.), Mitt. Bot. Staats. München 12:185. 1975. Microgyne Less. [nom. illeg.], Syn. Gen. Comp. 190. 1832. (not Cass. 1827). TYPE: Microgyne trifurcata Less.
 - Microgynella trifurcata (Less.) Grau, Mitt. Bot. Staats. München 12:185. 1975. BASIONYM: Microgyne trifurcata Less., Syn. Gen. Comp. 190. 1832. Erigeron trifurcatus (Less.) Gill. & Don ex Hook. & Arn., Comp. Bot. Mag. 2:49. 1836. Vittadinia trifurcata (Less.) Benth. & Hook. ex Griseb., Symb. Fl. Argent. 24:178. 1879.

Erigeron tridactylus DC., Prodr. 5:290. 1836.

- II. Sommerfeltia Less., Syn. Gen. Comp. 189. 1832. TYPE: Sommerfeltia spinulosa (Spreng.) Less.
 - Sommerfeltia spinulosa (Spreng.) Less., Syn. Gen. Comp. 190. 1832. BASIONYM: Conyza spinulosa Spreng., Syst. Veget. 3:510. 1826.
- III. Asteropsis Less., Syn. Gen. Comp. 188. 1832. TYPE: Asteropsis macrocephala Less.
 - Asteropsis macrocephala Less., Syn. Gen. Comp. 188. 1832. Podocoma macrocephala (Less.) Herter, Fl. Uruguay Pl. Vasc. [Estud. Bot. Reg. Urug.] 123. 1931.
 - Podopappus tomentosus Hook. & Arn., Comp. Bot. Mag. 2:51. 1836.
 - Neja macrocephala DC., Prodr. 5:325. 1836. This name is heterotypic with that of Asteropsis macrocephala Less.
- Neja sect. Phylloneja DC., Prodr. 5:325. 1836. Type (and only species): Neja macrocephala DC. (= Asteropsis macrocephala Less.).

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

I thank B.L. Turner and Mark Mayfield for their review of the manuscript and the staffs of MO and US for help during recent visits to their institutions.

LITERATURE CITED

- Baker, J.G. 1882. Compositae III. Asteroideae. In C.F.P. Martius, Fl. Bras. 6(3):1-100
- Bentham, G. 1873. Compositae. In Bentham, G. & J.D. Hooker. Gen. Pl. 2:163-533. A. Black, London, Great Britain.
- Cabrera, A.L. 1963. Flora de la Provincia de Buenos Aires. Tomo IV, Parte 6a. Compuestas. Colección Cientifica del I.N.T.A., Buenos Aires, Argentina.
- Chebataroff, P.J. 1981. Una nueva especie del género Sommerfeltia (Compositae). Hickenia 1:233-235.
- Grau, J. 1975. Podocoma und Vittadinia zwei vermeintlich bikontinentale Gattungen. Mitt. Bot. Staats. München 12:181-194.
- Grisebach, A.H.R. 1879. Symbolae ad Floram Argentinam. Dieterich, Göttingen, Sweden.
- Hoffmann, O. 1890. Tubuliflorae Astereae. In Die Naturlichen Pflanzenfamilien (A. Engler & K. Prantl [eds.]) 4(5):142-172. Wilhelm Engelmann, Leipzig, Germany.
- Hooker, W.J. & G.A.W. Arnott. 1836. Contributions toward a flora of South America and the islands of the Pacific. Comp. Bot. Mag. 2:41-52.
- Lessing, C.F. 1832. Synopsis Generum Compositarum. Dunckeri & Humblotii, Berlin, Germany.
- Nesom, G.L. 1993. A Cuban endemic: Hysterionica marginata (Asteraceae: Astereae) rather than Aster grisebachii. Phytologia 75:163-165.
- _____. 1994. Separation of Neja (Asteraceae: Astereae) from Hysterionica. Phytologia 76:168-175.
- Lanowiak. 1994. Taxonomic overview of Podocoma (Asteraceae: Astereae), with the incorporation of two species from Conyza. Phytologia 76:106-114.
- Zhang, X. & K. Bremer. 1993. A cladistic analysis of the tribe Astereae (Asteraceae) with notes on their evolution and subtribal classification. Pl. Syst. Evol. 184:259-283.